A theory of nonequilibrium steady states in quantum chaotic systems

Pei Wang[1,*]

[1]*Department of Physics, Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua 321004, China*

(Dated: July 19, 2016)

Nonequilibrium steady state (NESS) is a quasistationary state, in which exist currents that continuously produce entropy, but the local observables are stationary everywhere. We propose a theory of NESS under the framework of quantum chaos. In an isolated quantum system, there exist some initial states for which the thermodynamic limit and the long-time limit are noncommutative. The density matrix $\hat{\rho}$ of these states displays a universal structure. Suppose that $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ are different eigenstates of the Hamiltonian with energies E_α and E_β, respectively. $\langle\alpha|\,\hat{\rho}\,|\beta\rangle$ behaves as a random number which approximately follows the Laplace distribution with zero mean. In thermodynamic limit, the variance of $\langle\alpha|\,\hat{\rho}\,|\beta\rangle$ is a smooth function of $|E_\alpha - E_\beta|$, scaling as $1/|E_\alpha - E_\beta|^2$ in the limit $|E_\alpha - E_\beta| \to 0$. If and only if this scaling law is obeyed, the initial state evolves into NESS in the long time limit. We present numerical evidence of our hypothesis in a few chaotic models. Furthermore, we find that our hypothesis implies the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) in a bipartite system.

arXiv:1607.05231v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 18 Jul 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Ever since the establishment of statistical mechanics, a unified theory of nonequilibrium steady state (NESS) is the goal of theoretical physicists. According to second law of thermodynamics, a macroscopic isolated system will eventually relax to thermal equilibrium. But if the system is infinitely large, it may take infinitely long time to remove the imbalances in the initial state. The system then can never reach thermal equilibrium. Instead, it will relax to a nonequilibrium steady state, in which exist currents that continuously produce entropy, but the local observables are stationary everywhere. For example, a system composing of two infinite reservoirs at different temperatures will relax to NESS, in which the heat persistently flows from the hotter reservoir to the colder one.

In this paper we discuss the theory of NESS in quantum systems. NESS in classical systems is also an active area of research[1]. Nevertheless, the microscopic mechanical law is quantum. Various approaches have been developed for studying NESS[2]. Kubo formula[3] is valid if the deviation from thermal equilibrium is infinitesimal. The nonequilibrium Green's functions technique[4] was employed in the irreversible processes starting from an equilibrium state. Landauer-Büttiker formula[5,6] was specifically designed for a scattering region coupled to multiple thermal reservoirs. Hershfield[7] derived an expression for the density matrix of NESS. These approaches all depend on an explicitly defined initial state. But statistical mechanics reminds us that the initial memory is lost in the thermalization process. And a thermalized state depends only upon very few parameters like the total energy and particle number. The idea of lost memory is at the heart of maximized entropy principle, which lays a foundation of the unified description of equilibrium states. Similarly, one expects that some redundant information in the initial state should be lost in the evolution to NESS. And a unified description of NESS emerges once if the surviving information can be distinguished from the lost information.

The lost information in the thermalization process has been well addressed, thanks to the development of quantum chaos theory. According to this theory, generic (i.e. chaotic) systems with complicated interactions between particles must be distinguished from integrable systems. The former can thermalize, but the latter cannot[8]. The eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) was proposed[9–11]. It explains why an isolated system loses its memory in spite of the fact that the wave function follows a unitary evolution. ETH states that the matrix elements of physical observables in the eigenbasis of Hamiltonian can be expressed as[11,12]

$$O_{\alpha\beta} = O(\bar{E})\delta_{\alpha,\beta} + e^{-S(\bar{E})/2} f_O(\bar{E},\epsilon) R_{\alpha\beta}, \qquad (1)$$

where $\bar{E} = (E_\alpha + E_\beta)/2$ and $\epsilon = E_\alpha - E_\beta$ denote the average of and the difference between two eigenenergies, respectively. The diagonal element $O(\bar{E})$ is a smooth function of energy. While the off-diagonal elements are exponentially small with $S(\bar{E})$ denoting the thermodynamic entropy. S is related to the density of many-body states by $D = e^S$. The off-diagonal elements are the product of a smooth function $f_O(\bar{E},\epsilon)$ and a random number $R_{\alpha\beta}$ with zero mean and unit variance. Starting from a typical initial state, the long time limit of observables depends only upon the main diagonal of the initial density matrix[13] which is sometimes called the diagonal ensemble. The diagonal ensemble is not necessarily an equilibrium ensemble. But according to Eq. (1), one cannot distinguish the values of observables with respect to different eigenstates whose energies are the same. Therefore, the diagonal ensemble and the equilibrium ensemble predict same results for the observables. In this sense a chaotic quantum system thermalizes. The loss of memory is caused by the averaging out of the off-diagonal elements.

If a chaotic system evolves into NESS, one expects that the initial memory should be lost in a similar way. But ETH cannot explain the existence of NESS by itself. To



FIG. 1. Schematic diagram of a bipartite system hosting NESS. The long time limit $t \to \infty$ and the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$ are noncommutative.

address the nature of NESS, we propose the nonequilibrium steady state hypothesis (NESSH). This hypothesis provides a unified description of NESS, and makes it clear which information in the initial state is lost in the evolution to NESS.

II. DEFINITION OF NONEQUILIBRIUM STEADY STATES

Let us first discuss the definition of NESS in isolated systems. Some authors are used to talking about NESS in open systems. Nevertheless, an open system can always be treated as part of a larger isolated system.

We notice next facts:

(1) The exclusive characteristic of NESS is the existence of "nonequilibrium" currents. These currents are distinguished from the circular currents that may exist in some equilibrium states, e.g., the persistent current in a mesoscopic ring[14]. Nonequilibrium currents result from the tendency to remove the particle (energy) distribution imbalance. The system returns to thermal equilibrium by removing these imbalances. Therefore, nonequilibrium currents produce entropy. For example, the heat flow from the hotter part of a system to the colder part is a nonequilibrium current. Integrable systems after a quench will relax to non-thermal states[15] in which there is no current or entropy production. We distinguish these non-thermal states from NESS. The system is in NESS if and only if there exist stationary nonequilibrium currents, which is denoted by $\hat{I}$.

(2) In a **finite** isolated system, eigenstates do not carry nonequilibrium currents. Because if there exist nonequilibrium currents, the particle (energy) distribution must change with time due to the conservation law. This contradicts the fact that physical observables keep invariant in an eigenstate. Especially, let us consider a bipartite system with the number of particles in the left and right part being $\hat{N}_L$ and $\hat{N}_R$, respectively. The nonequilibrium current from L to R is $\hat{I} = d\hat{N}_R/dt = i[\hat{H}, \hat{N}_R]$. It is straightforward to prove $\langle\alpha|\,\hat{I}\,|\alpha\rangle = 0$ for an eigenstate $|\alpha\rangle$. Note that eigenstates in finite systems can carry circular currents, since they do not change the particle (energy) distribution.

(3) In a finite system, if an observable relaxes to its stationary value in the long time limit, it must be determined by the diagonal ensemble[13]:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} O(t) = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T dt O(t) = \mathbf{Tr}\left[\hat{\rho}_d \hat{O}\right], \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\rho}_d = \sum_\alpha \langle\alpha|\,\hat{\rho}\,|\alpha\rangle\,|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|$ is the diagonal ensemble. $\hat{\rho}$ is the initial density matrix. Nonequilibrium currents must be zero in the diagonal ensemble due to fact (2). Therefore, diagonal ensemble is distinguished from NESS.

Due to facts (1-3), NESS should be a quasistationary state. In a finite system, this state survives for a while, but finally relaxes to the diagonal ensemble. But if the system's size goes to infinity, i.e. the thermodynamic limit, the lifetime of this quasistationary state goes to infinity. It then becomes a real steady state. NESS exists if and only if the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$ and the long time limit $t \to \infty$ are noncommutative:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\lim_{t\to\infty} I(t) \neq \lim_{t\to\infty}\lim_{N\to\infty} I(t). \quad (3)$$

According to fact (3), the left hand side equals zero. Therefore, the right hand side is nonzero, that is a stationary nonequilibrium current survives.

We define NESS as follows: **If the thermodynamic limit and the long time limit are noncommutative for a specific initial state of an isolated system, taking $N \to \infty$ before taking $t \to \infty$ results in a NESS.** It is worth emphasizing that in NESS the two limits are noncommutative for arbitrary observables, but not only for the current.

An example is helpful for understanding the noncommutativity of the two limits. Let us consider two reservoirs at different water levels which are connected by a pipe (see Fig. 1). Water flows from left to right to remove the level imbalance. The flow stops after the left and right levels reach the same. But if the reservoirs are infinitely large, the flow never stops, since the level imbalance cannot be removed within finite period.

III. NONEQUILIBRIUM STEADY STATE HYPOTHESIS

Let us start from the Schrödinger equation and see why Eq. (3) is possible. The time-dependent current is expressed as

$$I(t) = \sum_{\alpha\neq\beta} e^{-i(E_\alpha - E_\beta)t}\rho_{\alpha\beta} I_{\beta\alpha}, \quad (4)$$

where $\rho_{\alpha\beta} = \langle\alpha|\,\hat{\rho}\,|\beta\rangle$ and $I_{\beta\alpha} = \langle\beta|\,\hat{I}\,|\alpha\rangle$ are the initial density matrix and the current matrix, respectively. α and β are the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian. E_α and E_β are their eigenenergies, respectively. Notice that terms with $\alpha = \beta$ are excluded from the sum, because

the diagonal elements of I are zero. If $\lim_{t\to\infty} I(t)$ exists, it must be equal to the averaged current over $[0,T]$ as $T\to\infty$, i.e. $\bar{I}=\sum_{\alpha\neq\beta}\frac{e^{-i(E_\alpha-E_\beta)T}-1}{-i(E_\alpha-E_\beta)T}\rho_{\alpha\beta}I_{\beta\alpha}$. At a specific T, the pairs of eigenstates with energy difference $|E_\alpha-E_\beta|\gg 2\pi/T$ do not contribute to $\bar{I}$. We say that the phase coherence between these pairs is lost. If the system's size is finite, the level spacing has a minimum, therefore, there always exists sufficiently large T when all the eigenstate pairs satisfy $|E_\alpha-E_\beta|\gg 2\pi/T$. The phase coherence is totally lost, and the stationary current must be zero. But if the system's size is infinite, the level spacing goes to zero. For arbitrarily large T, there exist eigenstate pairs that satisfy $|E_\alpha-E_\beta|\ll 2\pi/T$. The phase coherence between these pairs survives. The superposition of these neighbor eigenstates may carry a finite nonequilibrium current as $\langle\beta|\hat{I}|\alpha\rangle\neq 0$. In above we do not consider the degeneracy, which is broken in a chaotic system.

NESS is essentially a partially-coherent state, which exists in thermodynamic limit. In a finite system with the averaged level spacing Δ, the phase coherence between all the eigenstate pairs is lost at the time scale $\hbar/\Delta$. While the current usually relaxes to its stationary value at a much shorter time which is denoted as $\hbar/\Gamma$. Γ is determined by the interaction strength or the bandwidth of the system. During the time $\hbar/\Gamma\ll t\ll\hbar/\Delta$, the current is quasistationary. This quasistationary current gradually approaches the stationary current in NESS as the system's size increases. One can study the properties of NESS by doing a proper scaling in finite systems[16].

In integrable systems the characteristics of the matrix $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ or $I_{\beta\alpha}$ vary from model to model[17]. NESS in integrable systems shares no common feature. But it is not the case in chaotic systems. According to ETH (1), the current matrix has indeed a general expression in arbitrary chaotic systems, which is

$$I_{\alpha\neq\beta}=e^{-S(\bar{E})/2}f_I(\bar{E},\epsilon)R^I_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{5}$$

Note that $\bar{E}=(E_\alpha+E_\beta)/2$ and $\epsilon=E_\alpha-E_\beta$. We then guess that the off-diagonal elements of the density matrix have a similar expression:

$$\rho_{\alpha\neq\beta}=e^{-S(\bar{E})/2}f_\rho(\bar{E},\epsilon)R^\rho_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{i}$$

Ansatz (i) is distinguished from ETH. Because the density matrix is not a few-body operator, and then must be distinguished from physical observables. The diagonal element $\rho_{\alpha\alpha}$ is not necessarily a smooth function of E_α. Notice that ansatz (i) stands for a generic state, but not for a fine-tuned one such as eigenstates. We note that, to the best of our knowledge, ansatz (i) has not been clearly written down before, but the idea behind it is not new. In random matrix theory (RMT), it was proved that the eigenstates of random matrices in any basis are random unit vectors[12]. Due to the similarity between random matrices and quantum chaotic systems, a generic state in the eigenbasis of a chaotic system should also be a random vector. Correspondingly, the off-diagonal elements of a generic density matrix are random numbers. Ansatz (i) goes further by proposing an envelop function $f_\rho(\bar{E},\epsilon)$.

The randomness of $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ and $I_{\alpha\beta}$ can be understood as follows. Choose two real numbers $\bar{E}$ and ϵ. If the system's size is large enough, there should be many eigenstate pairs (α,β) whose averaged energy $(E_\alpha+E_\beta)/2$ and energy difference $E_\alpha-E_\beta$ fall within the thin shells centered at $\bar{E}$ and ϵ, respectively. The value of $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ or $I_{\alpha\beta}$ fluctuates within these pairs like a random number with some proposed distribution. Notice that in thermodynamic limit, the number of pairs within a finite shell goes to infinity. And we should set the shell width to infinitesimal for obtaining the distribution of $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ or $I_{\alpha\beta}$. Because the distribution may change with $\bar{E}$ or ϵ.

It is worth emphasizing that $R^I_{\alpha\beta}$ and $R^\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ are two random numbers with zero mean and unit variance. It is reasonable to suppose that their correlation is independent of $\bar{E}$ or ϵ:

$$\overline{R^\rho_{\alpha\beta}R^I_{\beta\alpha}}=\mathcal{C}_{\rho I}. \tag{6}$$

Or at least $\mathcal{C}_{\rho I}$ changes very slowly with $\bar{E}$ or ϵ.

Since the entropy $S(\bar{E})$ is real, the hermitianity of ρ and I requires

$$\begin{aligned} f_\rho(\bar{E},\epsilon)&=f^*_\rho(\bar{E},-\epsilon),\ \ R^\rho_{\alpha\beta}=\left(R^\rho_{\beta\alpha}\right)^*,\\ f_I(\bar{E},\epsilon)&=f^*_I(\bar{E},-\epsilon),\ \ R^I_{\alpha\beta}=\left(R^I_{\beta\alpha}\right)^*. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Let us consider a popular situation - a real Hamiltonian together with a purely imaginary current operator. This corresponds to a system with time-reversal symmetry. For example, let us consider a fermionic lattice model with the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}=-\sum_{m,j}g_{m,j}\hat{c}^\dagger_m\hat{c}_j+U_{m,j}\hat{n}_m\hat{n}_j$ where $\hat{n}_j=\hat{c}^\dagger_j\hat{c}_j$. The current operator from site m to j is $\hat{I}=ig_{m,j}\left(\hat{c}^\dagger_j\hat{c}_m-\text{H.c.}\right)$. Since $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ is real but $I_{\alpha\beta}$ is purely imaginary, we suppose R^I and R^ρ to be real symmetric matrices. And we suppose $f_\rho(\bar{E},\epsilon)=f_\rho(\bar{E},-\epsilon)$ to be real but $f_I(\bar{E},\epsilon)=-f_I(\bar{E},-\epsilon)$ to be purely imaginary functions.

Now let us discuss the condition of f_ρ under which the nonequilibrium current survives in the steady limit. Substituting Eq. (5-6) and ansatz (i) into Eq. (4), we obtain

$$I(t)=\mathcal{C}_{\rho I}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}d\bar{E}D(\bar{E})\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}d\epsilon e^{-i\epsilon t}f_\rho(\bar{E},\epsilon)f_I(\bar{E},-\epsilon), \tag{8}$$

where $D(\bar{E})=e^{S(\bar{E})}$ denotes the density of many-body states. To get Eq. (8) we used $\sum_\alpha\to\int dE_\alpha D\left(E_\alpha\right)$ and $D\left(\bar{E}\pm\epsilon/2\right)\approx D\left(\bar{E}\right)$. The latter approximation is due to the fast decay of $f_\rho(\bar{E},\epsilon)f_I(\bar{E},-\epsilon)$ as $|\epsilon|$ increases. Therefore, most contribution to $\int d\epsilon$ comes from

a shallow window of ϵ in which D almost keeps a constant. It was already observed that the off-diagonal elements of observables decay quickly as $|\epsilon|$ increases[18]. Eq. (8) is surprisingly simple. The detail of the model and the initial state is hidden behind the random matrices R^I and R^ρ. Their contribution to $I(t)$ is simplified into a constant $\mathcal{C}_{\rho I}$. $\lim_{t\to\infty} I(t) \neq 0$ is equivalent to $\lim_{t\to\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\epsilon e^{-i\epsilon t} f_\rho f_I \neq 0$, that is the Fourier transformation of $f_\rho f_I$ has a nonzero limit as $t \to \infty$. According to Riemann-Lebesgue lemma[19], $f_\rho f_I$ cannot be an integrable function. Instead, $f_\rho f_I$ must be the product of $1/\epsilon$ and an integrable function. Then, the nonequilibrium current obeys $\lim_{t\to\infty} I(t) \neq 0$ but $\lim_{t\to\infty} dI(t)/dt = 0$ (the proof is present in follows). The existence and stationarity of nonequilibrium current require a factor $1/\epsilon$ in either f_ρ or f_I. $1/\epsilon$ cannot be a factor of f_I. Otherwise, $\lim_{t\to\infty} I(t) \neq 0$ for arbitrary f_ρ, which contradicts the fact that most initial states thermalize. Therefore, $1/\epsilon$ must be a factor of f_ρ.

According to the above argument, we propose our second ansatz. Initial states can be classified into typical and atypical states. Typical initial states thermalize in the long time limit in which $\lim_{t\to\infty} I(t) = 0$. The envelop function f_ρ of typical density matrices is an integrable function of ϵ. On the other hand, atypical initial states evolve into NESS in which $\lim_{t\to\infty} I(t) \neq 0$. The corresponding envelop function scales as $1/\epsilon$ in the limit $\epsilon \to 0$. One can express the atypical envelop function as

$$f_\rho(\bar{E}, \epsilon) = \frac{\rho(\bar{E}, \epsilon)}{|\epsilon|}, \tag{ii}$$

where $\rho(\bar{E}, \epsilon)$ is an integrable function and converges in the limit $\epsilon \to 0$. The denominator is $|\epsilon|$ because the hermitianity requires $f_\rho(\bar{E}, \epsilon)$ to be even. Ansatz (i) and (ii) combine into our nonequilibrium steady state hypothesis: **The off-diagonal elements of an initial density matrix that evolves into NESS can be expressed as**

$$\rho_{\alpha\neq\beta} = \frac{e^{-S(\bar{E})/2}\rho(\bar{E}, \epsilon)}{|\epsilon|} R^\rho_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{NESSH}$$

NESSH means that the off-diagonal elements of atypical density matrices are random numbers. And their variance scales as $1/\epsilon^2$ in the diagonal limit.

According to ansatz (ii), if $\rho(\bar{E}, \epsilon)$ is real but $f_I(\bar{E}, \epsilon)$ is purely imaginary, the expression of stationary current can be further simplified into

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} I(t) = i\pi \mathcal{C}_{\rho I} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{E} D(\bar{E}) \rho(\bar{E}, 0) f_I(\bar{E}, 0^+), \tag{9}$$

where $f_I(\bar{E}, 0^+) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} f_I(\bar{E}, \epsilon)$. Notice that the odd function $f_I(\bar{E}, \epsilon)$ is discontinuous at $\epsilon = 0$. This will be verified in the following numerical experiments. To get Eq. (9) we used the Dirichlet integral $\int dx \sin(x)/x = \pi$.

Starting from NESSH, we can prove for an arbitrary observable $\hat{O}$ that $\lim_{t\to\infty} O(t)$ exists and it is distinguished from the value of $\hat{O}$ in the diagonal ensembles, i.e. $\sum_\alpha \rho_{\alpha\alpha} O_{\alpha\alpha}$. This meets our definition of NESS. $O(t)$ can be divided into $\sum_\alpha \rho_{\alpha\alpha} O_{\alpha\alpha}$ and $O_{NE}(t)$. The latter comes from the off-diagonal elements of initial density matrices. $O_{NE}(t)$ can be obtained in the same way as $I(t)$. According to NESSH, we have

$$O_{NE}(t) = \mathcal{C}_{\rho O} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{E} D(\bar{E}) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\epsilon e^{-i\epsilon t} \frac{\rho(\bar{E}, \epsilon)}{|\epsilon|} f_O(\bar{E}, -\epsilon) \tag{10}$$

with $\mathcal{C}_{\rho O} = \overline{R^\rho_{\alpha\beta} R^O_{\beta\alpha}}$. Let us study the expression of dO_{NE}/dt, in which the integral with respect to ϵ is the Fourier transformation of ρf_O. But ρ and f_O are both integrable functions. According to Riemann-Lebesgue lemma, in the limit $t \to \infty$, dO_{NE}/dt vanishes and then O_{NE} must approach a stationary value. And this stationary value is nonzero since the integrand in Eq. (10) is not integrable with $|\epsilon|$ appearing in the denominator. The limit of $O_{NE}(t)$ is just the commutator between the thermodynamic limit and the long time limit:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} O_{NE}(t) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{N\to\infty} O(t) - \lim_{N\to\infty} \lim_{t\to\infty} O(t). \tag{11}$$

Notice that, if ρf_O has a real part, we cannot get a simple expression for $\lim_{t\to\infty} O_{NE}(t)$ like Eq. (9). Because the integral $\int d\epsilon \cos(\epsilon t)/|\epsilon|$ is divergent. But this does not indicate that $O_{NE}(t)$ is also divergent. One should not forget that we actually deal with a finite system (otherwise, the density of states $D(\bar{E})$ is infinite and Eq. (10) makes no sense). Therefore, ϵ has indeed an infrared cutoff - the level spacing between neighbor eigenstates Δ. And one must keep $t \ll \hbar/\Delta$ for obtaining the correct nonequilibrium steady limit. We leave the problem of calculating $\lim_{t\to\infty} O_{NE}(t)$ in future research.

NESSH clarifies how the initial memory is lost in the evolution to NESS. The density matrix always follows a unitary evolution:

$$\rho_{\alpha\beta}(t) = \delta_{\alpha,\beta}\rho_{\alpha\alpha} + e^{-i\epsilon t} \frac{e^{-S(\bar{E})/2}\rho(\bar{E}, \epsilon)}{|\epsilon|} R^\rho_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{12}$$

In the thermalization process, all the information contained in the second term is lost. NESS keeps more information than thermalized states. The stationary current depends on the value of $\rho(\bar{E}, 0)$. But all the off-diagonal elements with $|\epsilon| > 0$ average out in the evolution to NESS. NESS only keeps memory of the off-diagonal elements with infinitesimal energy difference. Furthermore, $\rho_{\alpha\alpha}$ is insensitive to the change of α once if E_α is fixed (ETH). This explains why thermalization happens. Similarly, the detail of the initial state is contained in the matrix $R^\rho_{\alpha\beta}$. But $R^\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ contributes to the value of an observable through its correlation with $R^O_{\alpha\beta}$. Physical observables are then insensitive to the detail of $R^\rho_{\alpha\beta}$. This is the reason why NESS looks "universal".

IV. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS IN RANDOM MATRICES

We test NESSH (ansatz (i) and (ii)) in a few chaotic models.

Let us first consider a bipartite structure as shown in Fig. 1. The system composes of two weakly-coupled reservoirs (the meaning of "weakly-coupled" will be discussed below). The Hamiltonian of each reservoir is a random matrix or to be specific, a Gaussian orthogonal ensemble (GOE)[20]. In detail, GOE is a real symmetric matrix. Its diagonal (off-diagonal) entries are independent random numbers, and each follows the Gaussian distribution with zero mean and variance σ^2 ($\sigma^2/2$). We have two reasons for choosing random matrices. First, random matrices are believed to have the same properties as quantum chaotic systems. Second, NESSH should in principle be tested in thermodynamic limit. While random matrices of small dimensions already display thermodynamic properties. To see these properties in "real" models, the dimensions of the Hamiltonian have to be very large, therefore, numerical calculation is more difficult. Anyway, we also test NESSH in a "real" model. The results will be discussed in next section.

Suppose that there are n eigenstates in each reservoir. The eigenenergies are denoted as $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \cdots, \varepsilon_n$. According to random matrix theory, the probability density of eigenenergies is[20]

$$P(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \cdots, \varepsilon_n) = \frac{e^{-\frac{\varepsilon_1^2+\cdots+\varepsilon_n^2}{2\sigma^2}} \left|\prod_{m>j} (\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_j)\right|}{\sigma^{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}} (2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\Gamma(1+j/2)}{\Gamma(3/2)}}. \tag{13}$$

We use γ_L and γ_R to denote the eigenstates of the left and right reservoir, respectively. They are not the eigenstates of the whole system, since the two reservoirs are coupled. The coupling Hamiltonian is expressed as a matrix V in the basis $|\gamma_L\gamma_R\rangle$. The matrix elements $V_{\gamma_L\gamma_R,\gamma_L'\gamma_R'}$ are independent random numbers. Each follows the Gaussian distribution with zero mean and variance σ_c^2. For the coupling to be weak, we require $\sigma_c \ll \sigma$. Furthermore, σ_c must change with the system's size while $\sigma_c n$ keeps a constant. This scaling behavior can be understood by considering next example. Two chains of length n are coupled at the end sites. The Hamiltonian of each chain can be diagonalized by a Fourier transformation. After the transformation, the rescaled coupling between left and right levels must have an extra factor $1/n$. Or n times the coupling strength is a constant. This condition guarantees that the coupling energy does not increase with the system's size. The energy flow between reservoirs is then bounded as the reservoir's size goes to infinity. Therefore, the initial imbalance cannot be removed in finite period. The weak coupling condition is necessary for NESS.

The total Hamiltonian can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H} = &\sum_{\gamma_L,\gamma_R} (\varepsilon_{\gamma_L} + \varepsilon_{\gamma_R}) |\gamma_L\gamma_R\rangle \langle\gamma_L\gamma_R| \\ &+ V_{\gamma_L\gamma_R,\gamma_L'\gamma_R'} |\gamma_L\gamma_R\rangle \langle\gamma_L'\gamma_R'|.\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The eigenstate of the whole system is denoted as $|\alpha\rangle$ which satisfies $\hat{H}|\alpha\rangle = E_\alpha |\alpha\rangle$. We employ $|\gamma_L\gamma_R\rangle$ as the initial state. This corresponds to that the two reservoirs are initially decoupled and the coupling is then switched on for the heat to flow. The initial imbalance manifests as the difference between ε_{γ_L} and ε_{γ_R}. Without loss of generality, we set $\epsilon_{\gamma_L} > \epsilon_{\gamma_R}$, i.e. the left reservoir is hotter than the right one. If $|\varepsilon_{\gamma_L} - \varepsilon_{\gamma_R}|$ increases with the system's size and goes to infinity in thermodynamic limit, the initial imbalance will survive in the long time limit. We denote the inner product between the initial state and the eigenstate as $K^\alpha_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} = \langle\gamma_L\gamma_R|\alpha\rangle$. NESSH should then be equivalently expressed as

$$K^\alpha_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} K^\beta_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} = \frac{e^{-S(\bar{E})/2}\rho(\bar{E},\epsilon)}{|\epsilon|} R_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{15}$$

A. NESSH implies ETH

Let us study the current operator. Here the nonequilibrium current is the energy current between two reservoirs. Due to the conservation of total energy, we define the current from left to right as $\hat{I} = -d\hat{H}_L(t)/dt$. $\hat{H}_L = \sum \epsilon_{\gamma_L} |\gamma_L\rangle \langle\gamma_L|$ denotes the Hamiltonian of the left reservoir. The matrix elements of $\hat{I}$ in the eigenbasis are $I_{\alpha\neq\beta} = -i\epsilon \sum_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} \varepsilon_{\gamma_L} K^\alpha_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} K^\beta_{\gamma_L\gamma_R}$. Substituting Eq. (15) in, we immediately obtain

$$I_{\alpha\neq\beta} = -i\mathbf{sgn}(\epsilon) e^{-\frac{S(\bar{E})}{2}} \sum_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} \varepsilon_{\gamma_L} \rho(\bar{E},\epsilon) R_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{16}$$

Since $R_{\alpha\beta}$ for different $(\gamma_L\gamma_R)$ are independent random numbers and ρ is an integrable function, the sum of $\varepsilon_{\gamma_L}\rho R_{\alpha\beta}$ should also be an integrable function times a random number with zero mean and unit variance. We define $f_I R^I_{\alpha\beta} = -i\mathbf{sgn}(\epsilon) \sum \varepsilon_{\gamma_L} \rho R_{\alpha\beta}$. Eq. (16) is then just the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (5). In this way, we showed that NESSH implies ETH. Notice that we have not used the proposition that each reservoir is described by a random matrix. Our derivation stands in arbitrary bipartite systems.

Furthermore, $\mathbf{sgn}(\epsilon)$ appears in the expression of $I_{\alpha\beta}$, indicating that the odd function $f_I(\bar{E},\epsilon)$ is discontinuous at $\epsilon = 0$, as what we expected. The correlation $\mathcal{C}_{\rho I}$ can be extracted from Eq. (16), which is

$$\mathcal{C}_{\rho I} = -i\mathbf{sgn}(\epsilon) \frac{\varepsilon_{\gamma_L}\rho(\bar{E},\epsilon)}{f_I(\bar{E},\epsilon)}. \tag{17}$$

Here we used $\overline{R_{\alpha\beta}R_{\beta\alpha}} = 1$.

B. NESSH in 2-by-2 random matrices

Let us consider the few body limit - only two levels in the left reservoir and a single level in the right one. The total Hamiltonian is a 2-by-2 matrix:

$$\hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} H_{11} & H_{12} \\ H_{21} & H_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{18}$$

Here $H_{12} = H_{21}$ is a random number denoting the coupling between reservoirs. The two eigenstates of $\hat{H}$ are denoted as $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)^T$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)^T$. The corresponding eigenenergies are E_α and E_β, respectively. With some boring but straightforward calculation, we express the eigenvectors in terms of H_{12}, E_α and E_β. We then obtain

$$\alpha_1\beta_1 = -\alpha_2\beta_2 = \frac{H_{12}}{|E_\alpha - E_\beta|}. \tag{19}$$

This is just the NESSH (15). It means that the off-diagonal elements of initial density matrix is a random number with the variance scaling as $1/|E_\alpha - E_\beta|^2$.

Note that the distribution of H_{12} is not precisely Gaussian in case of fixed E_α and E_β. The joint probability $P(E_\alpha, E_\beta, H_{12})$ is indeed

$$P\Big(H_{11}(E_\alpha, E_\beta, H_{12}), H_{22}(E_\alpha, E_\beta, H_{12})\Big) \times \frac{e^{-H_{12}^2/(2\sigma_c^2)}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{4H_{12}^2}{(E_\alpha - E_\beta)^2}}}, \tag{20}$$

where $P(H_{11}, H_{22})$ follows Eq. (13). But one can prove that, H_{12} approximately follows a Gaussian distribution with the constant variance σ_c^2 once if $(E_\alpha - E_\beta)^2 \gg 4H_{12}^2$. This condition is equivalent to the weak coupling condition.

C. NESSH in thermodynamic limit

After showing that NESSH can be proved in a 2-by-2 random matrix, we turn to the thermodynamic limit NESSH is proposed for. We numerically diagonalize the Hamiltonian (14) of dimensions up to tens of thousands. This corresponds to about 100 energy levels in each reservoir. We verify the hypothesis (15) in two steps. First, we show that $K^\alpha_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} K^\beta_{\gamma_L\gamma_R}$ is a random number and plot its distribution. Second, we show that the variance of $K^\alpha_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} K^\beta_{\gamma_L\gamma_R}$ becomes a smooth function of $\epsilon = E_\alpha - E_\beta$ in thermodynamic limit. And it scales as $1/\epsilon^2$ for small $|\epsilon|$.

Recall that the randomness of $K^\alpha_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} K^\beta_{\gamma_L\gamma_R}$ should be estimated in a set of (α, β) with $(E_\alpha + E_\beta)/2$ and $E_\alpha - E_\beta$ falling within two thin shells centered at $\bar{E}$ and ϵ, respectively. The shell width should be infinitesimal in thermodynamic limit. In the numerical simulation, we set the shell width to approximately two orders of magnitude smaller than the bandwidth of reservoirs. It is small enough for avoiding the influence of shell width on the distribution. While the shell still contains a few thousands samples, many enough for displaying the true distribution. The average of samples is found to be zero, fitting our prediction. We calculate the standard deviation of samples, which is denoted as σ_s. We then divide the interval $[-3\sigma_s, 3\sigma_s]$ into 200 bins and count the number of samples falling in each bin. The histogram is plotted in Fig. 2. Note that the y-axis is rescaled for the integral of $P\left(K^\alpha_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} K^\beta_{\gamma_L\gamma_R}\right)$ normalized to unity. Fig. 2(a) and (b) show the probability density $P\left(K^\alpha_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} K^\beta_{\gamma_L\gamma_R}\right)$ at different coupling strength. It looks regular, being symmetric to zero as we expected.



FIG. 2. (Color online) The distribution of $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ at $|E_\alpha - E_\beta| = 3$ in a bipartite random-matrix model ((a) and (b)) and in a lattice model ((c) and (d)). $(E_\alpha + E_\beta)/2 = 0$ is at the middle of the band. The red line shows the Laplace distribution with the same variance. (a) $n = 100$ and $\sigma_c = 0.01\sigma$. γ_L (γ_R) is the 10th highest (lowest) level. K_u evaluates 4.4. (b) $\sigma_c = 0.1\sigma$. The other parameters are the same as (a). K_u evaluates 3.8. (c) $n_f = 6$, $n_r = 8$ and $U_1 = U_2 = 0.8$. K_u evaluates 7.9. (d) $U_1 = U_2 = 0.5$. The other parameters are the same as (c). K_u evaluates 11.2.

To identify this distribution, we calculate the excess kurtosis of samples. Note that the excess kurtosis of a random number X with zero mean is defined as

$$K_u = \frac{\overline{X^4}}{\left(\overline{X^2}\right)^2} - 3. \tag{21}$$

The result of K_u changes with model parameters. But it is close to $K_u = 3$. Therefore, we guess that the distribution is Laplace[21]. We plot the Laplace distribution with the same variance (see the red lines in Fig. 2(a) and (b)) together with the distribution of samples. They approximately fit with each other.

In thermodynamic limit, NESSH predicts that the variance of $K^\alpha_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} K^\beta_{\gamma_L\gamma_R}$ scales as $1/(E_\alpha - E_\beta)^2$ in the



FIG. 3. (Color online) The variance of $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ times $(E_\alpha - E_\beta)^2$ as a function of $|E_\alpha - E_\beta|$ in the logarithmic scale. (a) and (b) are for the random-matrix model, and (c) and (d) are for the lattice model. The arrows mark the start and end points of the platform. (a) The variance at different coupling is compared, as the system's size is fixed to $n = 100$. (b) The variance at different system's size is compared, as the coupling is fixed to $n\sigma_c = 4$. (c) The chaotic region ($U_1 = U_2 = 0.5$) is compared with the integrable region ($U_1 = U_2 = 0$). (d) The variance at different system's size is compared, as the particle density is fixed to $n_f/n_r = 1/2$. The black line is for $n_f = 4$ while the red one for $n_f = 5$.

limit $|E_\alpha - E_\beta| \to 0$. Arbitrary atypical initial states must obey this scaling law. Let us see what should happen in a finite system. In a finite system, $|E_\alpha - E_\beta|$ has a lower bound - the level spacing Δ. The variance scales as $1/\epsilon^2$ in a range (ϵ_-, ϵ_+). Correspondingly, the nonequilibrium quasistationary state survives in the period $\hbar/\epsilon_+ < t < \hbar/\epsilon_-$. At the beginning of Sec. III, we have argued that $\hbar/\Gamma \ll t \ll \hbar/\Delta$. We then have $\epsilon_- > \Delta$. The variance might deviate from $1/\epsilon^2$ in a finite system as $\epsilon \to \Delta$. However, ϵ_- must approach zero in thermodynamic limit. Because the quasistationary state becomes a real steady state in thermodynamic limit. Notice that the variance for typical initial states does not display the $1/\epsilon^2$ scaling behavior. Instead, it is convergent in the diagonal limit.

We denote the variance of $K^\alpha_{\gamma_L\gamma_R} K^\beta_{\gamma_L\gamma_R}$ as Σ. To address the scaling behavior of Σ, we plot $\Sigma\epsilon^2$ as a function of ϵ in the logarithmic scale (see Fig. 3). This function should be a constant if $\Sigma \sim 1/\epsilon^2$. Therefore, a platform in $\Sigma\epsilon^2$ (or in $\ln(\Sigma\epsilon^2)$) signals the NESSH scaling law.

Fig. 3(a) plots $\ln(\Sigma\epsilon^2)$ vs. $\ln\epsilon$ for different coupling between reservoirs. The curve for $\sigma_c = 0.01\sigma$ (weak coupling) is significantly distinguished from that for $\sigma_c = 0.1\sigma$ (strong coupling). The former displays a clear platform at small ϵ, verifying the NESSH scaling law. At $\sigma_c = 0.04\sigma$, the platform is also clear but its position moves to the middle of the domain. But the curve for $\sigma_c = 0.1\sigma$ has a slope of 2 in almost the whole domain of ϵ, i.e. Σ keeps a constant. In the strong coupling regime (the coupling increases with the system's size), the two reservoirs are in fact a unity. The energy flow then has no upper bound in thermodynamic limit. The initial imbalance can always be removed in finite period. Therefore, all the initial states are typical states and will thermalize in the long time limit. Σ being a constant in the strong coupling regime meets our expectation. In fact, atypical states or NESS can be only found in the weak coupling regime.

In Fig. 3(b) we compare $\Sigma\epsilon^2$ at different system's size. As the system's size increases, the fluctuation of $\Sigma\epsilon^2$ is suppressed. We then expect Σ to be a smooth function of ϵ in thermodynamic limit. And the platform shifts towards smaller ϵ as the system's size increases, indicating $\epsilon_- \to 0$ in thermodynamic limit. The numerical results fit with the prediction of NESSH. Furthermore, Σ keeps a constant to the left of the platform (smaller ϵ), but decays as $1/\epsilon^4$ to the right of the platform (larger ϵ). Note that $\Sigma \propto f_\rho^2$. According to the expression of current (8), a constant Σ at small ϵ implies that the current decays to zero at large t. While $\Sigma \sim 1/\epsilon^4$ (or $f_\rho \sim 1/\epsilon^2$) at large ϵ implies that the current changes linearly at small t. Because the second derivative of $\int d\epsilon e^{-i\epsilon t} f_I(\epsilon)/\epsilon^2$ with respect to t is $\int d\epsilon e^{-i\epsilon t} f_I(\epsilon)$, which quickly decays to zero as t increases. The second derivative being zero indicates that the first derivative, i.e. dI/dt is a constant, or the current changes linearly. After the coupling between reservoirs is switched on, I first increases linearly to its quasistationary value, stays at this value for a while, and then decays to zero. This behavior meets our expectation.

V. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS IN A LATTICE MODEL

The random-matrix model is an empirical model. It does not originate from the microscopic description of matter. To verify NESSH in a more realistic model, we consider the spinless fermions located on a lattice of shape "∞". This model is a simplified version of a quantum dot coupled to two metallic leads. The left and right circles simulate the left and right leads, respectively. Each contains n_r sites. We employ a circle shape to avoid the scattering at the boundary. The two circles are connected via a center site (the quantum dot). The lattice then has $2n_r + 1$ sites in total. The fermions are only permitted to hop between the nearest-neighbor sites. If two fermions simultaneously occupy two nearest-neighbor sites, the interaction energy is U_1. If they occupy two next-nearest-neighbor sites, the interaction energy is U_2. The total Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H} = -\sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} \left(\hat{c}_i^\dagger \hat{c}_j + \text{H.c.}\right) + U_1 \sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} \hat{n}_i\hat{n}_j + U_2 \sum_{\langle\langle i,j\rangle\rangle} \hat{n}_i\hat{n}_j. \tag{22}$$

The total number of fermions is denoted as n_f which

satisfies $n_f < n_r$. The initial imbalance is realized by putting all the fermions on the left circle. To keep it simple, the initial position of fermions is random. We then estimate the distribution of the off-diagonal elements $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ in the initial density matrix. The distribution at different (U_1, U_2) is plotted in Fig. 2(c) and (d). Again, it is compared with the Laplace distribution. They only qualitatively fit with each other. The quantitative deviation is clear (the value of K_u deviates a lot from 3). We guess that the deviation is due to the small size of the system. Putting 6 fermions on 17 sites already results in 12376 possibilities. Increasing the system's size causes difficulty in the full diagonalization of Hamiltonian.

We estimate the variance of $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ as a function of ϵ. The results are plotted in Fig. 3(c) and (d). The Hamiltonian (22) is nonintegrable (chaotic) if U_1 and U_2 are nonzero, but is integrable at $U_1 = U_2 = 0$. This provides us a chance for checking the difference between chaotic systems and integrable systems. For integrable systems, the variance Σ depends strongly on the choice of the energy shell and does not have a well-defined thermodynamic limit. With fixed shell width, the curve Σ vs. ϵ displays a strong fluctuation (see Fig. 3(c), the black curve). This fluctuation is not suppressed as the system's size increases. But for chaotic systems, the fluctuation of Σ is much weaker (see Fig. 3(c), the red curve). And Fig. 3(d) shows that the fluctuation becomes even weaker as the system's size increases. In thermodynamic limit, Σ should be a smooth function of ϵ. Therefore, NESSH only stands in a chaotic system.

A platform in the function $\Sigma\epsilon^2$ can be observed (see Fig. 3(d)), indicating the emergence of the NESSH scaling law. Unfortunately, up to the largest system's size that we can handle, we do not find the trend of the platform moving towards smaller ϵ. Different models should be considered in future study.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Let us summarize the main ansatz and results of our theory. NESS is a quasistationary state in finite systems. It will eventually relax to thermal equilibrium. But in thermodynamic limit, NESS is a real steady state, because the thermodynamic limit and the long time limit are noncommutative. The initial states can be classified into typical and atypical states. Typical states thermalize in the long time limit, while atypical states will evolve into NESS. NESSH proposes the universal structure of atypical states in chaotic systems, as they are expressed as density matrices in the eigenbasis of the Hamiltonian. As shown in Eq. (NESSH) of Sec. III (or Eq. (i) and (ii)), the off-diagonal elements $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ of atypical density matrices behave as random numbers. Their variance is a smooth function of $|E_\alpha - E_\beta|$, scaling as $1/|E_\alpha - E_\beta|^2$ in the limit $|E_\alpha - E_\beta| \to 0$. This scaling law is the exclusive characteristic of NESS.

Based on this ansatz, the stationary current in NESS can be simply expressed as the variance of $\rho_{\alpha\beta}|E_\alpha - E_\beta|^2$ in the limit $|E_\alpha - E_\beta| \to 0$ (see Eq. (9)). Most off-diagonal elements of the initial density matrix are forgotten in the evolution to NESS. NESS only keeps memory of the off-diagonal elements with infinitesimal energy difference.

We show that NESSH implies ETH in an arbitrary bipartite system. And NESSH can be strictly proved in case of a 2-by-2 Hamiltonian by using the random matrix theory. Furthermore, we provide the numerical evidence of NESSH in two chaotic many-body models. One composes of two weak-coupled reservoirs that are described by random matrices. The other one is a lattice model of fermions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is supported by NSF of China under Grant No. 11304280.

* wangpei@zjnu.cn

[1] R. Zwanzig, *Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2001).
[2] S. Datta, *Electronic Transport in Mesoscopic Systems* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1997).
[3] R. Kubo, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **12**, 570 (1957).
[4] J. Rammer, *Quantum Field Theory of Non-equilibrium States* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007).
[5] M. Büttiker, Y. Imry, R. Landauer, and S. Pinhas, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 6207 (1985).
[6] M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1761 (1986).
[7] S. Hershfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2134 (1993).
[8] J. Eisert, M. Friesdorf, and C. Gogolin, Nat. Phys. **11**, 124 (2015).
[9] J. M. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 2046 (1991).
[10] M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. E **50**, 888 (1994).
[11] M. Srednicki, J. Phys. A **32**, 1163 (1999).
[12] L. D'Alessio, Y. Kafri, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, arXiv:1509.06411.
[13] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, Nature **452**, 854 (2008).
[14] M. Büttiker, Y. Imry, and R. Landauer, Phys. Lett. A **96**, 365 (1983).
[15] M. Rigol, A. Muramatsu, and M. Olshanii, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 053616 (2006).
[16] P. Wang, J. Stat. Mech., P09029 (2011).
[17] For example, one can consider free fermions in two weakly-coupled reservoirs. Noninteracting single impurity Anderson model is of this kind.

[18] E. Khatami, G. Pupillo, M. Srednicki, and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 050403 (2013).
[19] The Fourier transformation of an integrable function must decay to zero at infinity.
[20] V. E. Kravtsov, arXiv:0911.0639.
[21] The Laplace distribution with zero mean is defined as $P(x) \propto e^{-|x|/b}$.